

THE HOMONYMY OF *PAPILIO AGLAJA* LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA, PIERIDAE AND NYMPHALIDAE): REQUEST FOR VALIDATION Z.N.(S.) 1791

A further note in opposition to this application by B. C. S. Warren, F.R.E.S. and Cyril F. dos Passos, LL.B., D.Sc., F.R.E.S. (*Research Associate, Department of Entomology, The American Museum of Natural History, and Research Associate, Section of Insects and Spiders, the Carnegie Museum*)

Lt.-Col. C. F. Cowan, F.R.E.S., with his usual courtesy and thoughtfulness, has sent a copy of a further note in support of this application to the senior author of this paper, the original having been submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in December 1968. This note, although not dated, was received on 3 January 1969 and is in reply to our memorandum in opposition to the original application (1968 *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 25, pp. 68-71). We do not deem it necessary to answer Cowan's paper in detail but merely emphasize certain points that are essential to the decision of his application in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

1. As to Linnaeus, 1758, being the first reviser within the meaning of Article 24 of the Code which was adopted in 1953 and repealed the priority rule of 1948, Cowan seems to be vastly impressed by the "masterly way" in which Linnaeus published the tenth and twelfth editions of his works. We are no less impressed by those works, but that does not make Linnaeus a "first reviser" nonetheless within the meaning of Article 24, which provides that that term must be "rigidly construed". Cowan cites the fact that the title of the twelfth edition contains the words "Editio duodecima reformata", but these words are merely equivalent to "corrections and additions". He tries to persuade the reader to believe that Linnaeus in a "masterly way" expressed views that agree with the present Code, but we do not consider Linnaeus a reviser in the strict modern sense because he gave no reasons or explanations for his actions.

2. The instability in nomenclature that would result from the granting of Cowan's application:

(a) It is admitted that five modern works, published since 1942 following Hemming (1942), have used *charlotta* for the Nymphalid butterfly. We find only one, E. B. Ford (1945), that used *aglaja*. It would be a great inconvenience not to follow the weight of authority in the literature.

(b) As Cowan points out in paragraph 12, in the Pierids since 1893 all authors have used *aglaja* in the genus *Delias*. Our present concern, like Cowan's, is to preserve this usage, but that cannot be accomplished by reversing the usage shown in this paragraph, which would follow the granting of Cowan's application.

3. Even if a majority of the Commissioners should come to the conclusion that Linnaeus is a first reviser within the meaning of Article 24 of the Code as rigidly construed, there is still another question to be decided, i.e., whether the name *Papilio charlotta* Haworth, 1803, should not be conserved for the Nymphalid butterfly. In deciding that question, the provisions of the preamble of the Code are controlling. It is there provided in brief that, "The object of the Code is to promote stability . . . in the scientific names of animals . . . All its provisions are subservient to these ends . . .", while "Priority is the basic principle of zoological nomenclature. Its application, however, . . . may be moderated to preserve a long-accepted name in its accustomed meaning. When stability of nomenclature is threatened in an individual case, the strict application of the Code may . . . be suspended by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature".

As we have seen, the name *charlotta* came into use for the Nymphalid butterfly in 1942 and with one exception has been used by the leading authorities ever since. The name *aglaja* (for the Pierid) came into use in 1893 and has been used ever since by all the leading authorities. It is not conducive to stability of nomenclature to

alter this *status quo*, which has lasted for 25 years in one case and for 71 years in the other.

4. We are informed that another application concerning these names has been submitted by Mr. N. D. Riley. It is based, as Lt.-Col. Cowan's, on the status of Linnaeus as first reviser. Yet the two authors fail to agree as to the requisite names. As previously stated we base our application on the preamble of the Code (outlined above), which is superior to any of its provisions. The Commission cannot comply with Cowan's or Riley's requests without ignoring the established use of the names in the literature of the past 25 years. To do so would be a rejection of the principles of the Code.

For all the foregoing reasons as well as those in our memorandum in opposition to this application, we respectfully suggest that the applications be denied.

ADDITIONAL LITERATURE CITED

FORD, EDMUND BRISCO. 1945. Butterflies. The New Naturalist. London, Collins, 368 pp., 48 col. pls., 24 black and white pls.

COMMENT ON THE OBJECTIONS FORWARDED BY R. M. BAILEY TO THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *ELIPESURUS SPINICAUDA* SCHOMBURGK (PISCES). Z.N.(S.) 1825

(see volume 24, pages 353-355, volume 25, pages 133-134)

By Mariano M. Castex, S. J. (*Colegio maximo de San José, San Miguel, (E.G.S.M.), Argentina*)

I have gone through with great interest the objections forwarded by Reeve M. Bailey of the University of Michigan to the proposed suppression of *Elipesurus spinicauda* Schomburgk.

In his observations Bailey supports items 8(2), 8(3) and 8(6) but considers it inadvisable for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to support items 8(1), 8(4) and 8(5), that is, the suppression of the generic name *Elipesurus* Schomburgk, 1843 and the specific name *spinicauda* for the purposes of the Law of Priority and the placement of both names in the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

Bailey, who has not published works on this group until now and whose experience as he states in his paper "is a limited field experience with the group in 1964 in the Rio Guaporé (= Río Iténez) of the Madera system", has founded his objections on findings "published elsewhere" which we have not been able to obtain. His conclusions identify *E. spinicauda* with *Trygon stroglyopterus* Schomburgk, 1843 and both of these with *Disceus thayeri* Garman, 1913, this last identification being based on:

(1) the strong dermal spines greatly developed (with age) and disposed irregularly about the base of the tail,

(2) the complete covering of the pelvic fins by the pectoral disc,

(3) the absence of an anterior median prominence on the disc, and

(4) the slender and abruptly tapering tail, which he finds in the illustration of *Trygon stroglyopterus* made by Schomburgk.

To this I find it necessary to offer the following objections:

(1) my studies have not been centred, as Bailey remarks, merely on the Southern waters of the continent, and outside the range of *Disceus thayeri*. For nearly a decade I have been working on specimens obtained from nearly all the great rivers of our Southern continent and I have also gone through all the major collections currently existing (New York, Washington, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Santa Fé, La Plata, Sao Paulo, Paris, London, Leyden, Brussels, Frankfurt, Munich, East Berlin, and Harvard). Over 10,000 rays have been examined by me, covering not only South American waters, but also the Benoué system in West Africa.